

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 2 (legislative day of June 15), 1937

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

George S. Messersmith, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Wilbur J. Carr, of New York, now an Assistant Secretary of State, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia, vice J. Butler Wright.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Robert Jones Moulton, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from June 30, 1936.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. James Leo Dalton 2d, Cavalry, with rank from June 13, 1936, effective October 1, 1937.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2 (legislative day of June 15), 1937

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Hugh R. Wilson to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Miss Margaret M. Hanna to be a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Maj. Leonard Henderson Sims to Finance Department.
First Lt. Maddrey Allen Solomon to Field Artillery.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

William John Miede	Richard King Cole
Claude Wiggins Cummings	William White Southard
Robert Henry Lowry, Jr.	

To be majors

Douglas Sheldon Kellogg	Martin Eugene Griffin
Loren Donovan Moore	Mack Macon Green
Arthur Brinkley Welsh	William Edward Shambora
Eugene Wycoff Billick	Charles Henderson Beasley
Earle Standlee	Clifford Albert Best
Cecil Walker Dingman	Alvin Levi Gorby
William Kraus	George Ellis Armstrong
Reuel Edward Hewitt	

To be captains

Donald Meyers Ward	John DeWitt Morley
Angvald Vickoren	Frederic Ebelhare Cressman
William Earl Barry	Robert Tuthill Gants
Emmert Carl Lentz	Edward Beebe Payne
James Leslie Snyder	George Foster Peer
Raymond Richard Johanson	Harold Everus Harrison
Thair Cozzens Rich	Marshall Nelson Jensen
Frank Hugh Lane	Stephen Christopher Sitter
Byron Glen McKibben	

DENTAL CORPS

Mackey Joseph Real to be major.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captains

William Edwin Jennings
Curtis William Betzold

CHAPLAIN

John Simeon Kelly, United States Army, to be chaplain with the rank of captain.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Carroll Thompson Newton, Corps of Engineers.
Donald Clinton Clayman, Infantry.

Joseph Warren Sisson, Jr., Infantry.
David Greene Hammond, Corps of Engineers.
Joseph Russel Groves, Infantry.
Robert Whitsett van de Velde, Field Artillery.
Arthur George Christensen, Infantry.
Harry Gantcliffe Benion, Infantry.
Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., Field Artillery.
Arthur Charles Harris, Jr., Infantry.
Linwood Eugene Funchess, Corps of Engineers.
Laurence Clifford Brown, Infantry.
Jesse Mechem, Infantry.
Walter Ward Davis, Infantry.
William Andrew Enemark, Field Artillery.
Merten Kenneth Heimstead, Infantry.
Thaddeus Ronsaville Dulin, Infantry.
Leon John de Penna Rouge, Infantry.
Gaylord Walton Fraser, Infantry.
William Sherbourne McCrea, Infantry.
Donald Frederick Thompson, Infantry.
John Gordon Nelson, Coast Artillery Corps.
Chester Martin Beaver, Infantry.
Edward Wallace McLain, Coast Artillery Corps.
John Unsworth Allen, Corps of Engineers.
Byron William Ladd, Infantry.
Lyman Hodges Ripley, Coast Artillery Corps.
Francis Carlton Truesdale, Infantry.
William Shepherd Humphries, Infantry.
Donald Washington, Infantry.
Charles Robert Etzler, Infantry.
Phillip Cochran Tinley, Infantry.
Charles Murray Henley, Infantry.
John Brockway Rippere, Corps of Engineers.
Steve Archie Chappuis, Infantry.
Elmer Bolton Kennedy, Field Artillery.
James Jackson Stewart, Jr., Infantry.
Thomas Brownbridge Simpson, Corps of Engineers.
Paul Thomas Boleyn, Infantry.
Fredrick William Nagle, Infantry.
Otho Anthony Moomaw, Coast Artillery Corps.
Jabus Willie Rawls, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Andrew Buehler Zwaska, Infantry.
Jack Leslie Coan, Corps of Engineers.
Edward Francis Kent, Infantry.
George William Croker, Coast Artillery Corps.
Willard Wright Lazarus, Air Corps.
William Hart Hanson, Infantry.
John Willis Paddock, Infantry.
Joe Stallings Lawrie, Infantry.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD

GENERAL OFFICER

Charles Blaine Smathers to be brigadier general, National Guard of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1937

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Spera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we praise Thee that we are involved in a moral order which Thou hast ordained. We thank Thee that Thy changeless goodness pours itself upon us day by day. Gracious Lord, we rejoice in the ultimate triumph of civilization in that spirit which moved our forefathers to lift the veil of this western world. Their heroic, sacrificial devotion startled mankind no less than the principles they proclaimed. We pour at Thy altar a prayer of thanksgiving for the government they gave us—so lofty in its purpose, so wise in its construction that it guarantees to every citizen life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We thank Thee for the immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, broad in its denunciation of injustice and just in its declaration of the right. O Prince of Peace, on Thee we base our hopes and longings for all that makes life

dear. Increase our religious fervor and inspire us with holy patriotism that the genius of our Republic may be fulfilled. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor having reference to a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to a signal honor which was recently conferred upon my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. I refer to the action of the board of regents of the University of Michigan, on June 19, making Mr. ENGEL an honorary alumnus of the university.

In conferring the honor, the citation issued was as follows:

ALBERT JOSEPH ENGEL, Member of the United States Congress, from the Ninth Michigan District, has evidenced in many ways his interest in education and his loyalty to the university of the State in which he has made his home. A graduate of the law school of Northwestern University, he was admitted to the bar in 1910 and has since practiced at his home at Lake City. As a senator from his district, during four different sessions of Michigan's State Legislature, he proved himself a true and sympathetic advocate of the best interests of higher education. During the World War he served for 2 years in the American Expeditionary Force, retiring in 1919 with the rank of captain. As a Member of the House of Representatives, he has become well known in Washington for his interest in legislation affecting the training of youth. It is an honor and a pleasure to present to you, ALBERT JOSEPH ENGEL, as an honorary alumnus of the university, upon the unanimous action of the university committee on alumni relations, confirmed by the board of regents.

It is my privilege and honor to represent in this body the Second Congressional District of Michigan, in which is located the great University of Michigan. This university is very careful about bestowing honors of this kind, and I am informed that there are only nine persons now living to whom such an honor has been given.

I am sure that all Members of Congress will be pleased to join with me in congratulating Mr. ENGEL upon this distinction. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial which appeared in certain New Jersey newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BONNEVILLE DAM PROJECT

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, on which I hold membership, has

reported out favorably the bill (H. R. 7642) to authorize the completion, maintenance, and operation of the Bonneville project for navigation, and other purposes, and follows closely the language and provisions of my bill, H. R. 4948, introduced February 19, 1937. Passage of the bill H. R. 7642 is recommended with one amendment, on page 11, in lines 7 to 11, inclusive, to strike out "The Federal Power Commission in fixing rates for power on amortization costs on all major Federal power projects shall establish a rate of interest which shall be uniform throughout the United States", which is a new provision which was not contained in my bill, H. R. 4948, nor in any of the other bills which were introduced. It is the opinion of a majority of the committee that such a provision, pertaining to and affecting all Federal power projects, should properly be considered in connection with the zone legislation to provide regional administration of all such projects as recently recommended by the President in his message to the Congress and after the cost of generating electric power and the cost of financing in various parts of the country have been thoroughly studied and probed as a basis for correctly determining the question of uniformity of interest rates and other related subjects.

GENERAL PURPOSES OF THE BILL

The bill provides that the Bonneville project, now in the course of construction and nearly completed on the Columbia River at Bonneville in the State of Oregon and North Bonneville in the State of Washington, shall be completed, maintained, and operated under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, subject to certain powers therein conferred upon the Columbia River administrator respecting the transmission and distribution of surplus electric energy generated at said project. Power will be ready for transmission late this year or early in the next and consequently the matter requires prompt consideration.

This bill also confers jurisdiction upon the Federal Power Commission to approve and revise rates to be charged for the sale of the surplus electric energy.

The bill represents the synthesis of recommendations made by various Members of the Congress from the Northwest and of the committee after extensive study of this subject. The Bonneville administration is intended to be provisional pending establishment of a permanent administration for Bonneville and other projects in the Columbia River Basin.

The bill, with the exception of section 6, deals exclusively with the maintenance and operation of the Bonneville project and provides that surplus electric energy generated at said project may be sold under contracts to States, political subdivisions thereof, or to individuals or privately owned corporations, but preference is given to States and public bodies. In order fully to preserve and protect the preferential rights established by the bill, 50 percent of the firm electric energy generated at Bonneville shall be reserved until January 1, 1941, for public bodies, and thereafter conflicting applications between any public agency on the one hand and any private agency on the other shall be resolved in favor of the public agency. Contracts for the sale of surplus energy shall be for terms not exceeding 20 years, including renewals.

Section 6 provides machinery for making certain readjustments in the Boulder Canyon Project Act occasioned by the standards set up in this act.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 carries the reference to the Bonneville project, which is to be completed for the purpose of improving navigation on the Columbia River and leaves the operation in the control of the Secretary of War.

Section 2 states that the administrator shall dispose of surplus energy. The administrator is to be appointed by and be responsible to the Secretary of the Interior. He shall act in consultation with an advisory board composed of a representative designated by the Secretary of War, another by the Secretary of the Interior, and a third by the Federal

Power Commission. The administrator is authorized to transmit electric energy so as to encourage the widest possible use and to prevent monopolization by limited groups or localities. He is authorized in the name of the United States to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, real and personal property, including lands, franchises, transmission lines, substations, and patent rights. The administrator is authorized to sell or dispose of property, except that in the case of real property or transmission lines he must secure the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. He is authorized to enter into such contracts as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 3 defines the terms "public bodies" and "cooperatives" as used in the act and establishes a preference in the disposal of electric energy for public bodies and cooperatives. To preserve these preferential rights, not less than 50 percent of the electric energy at Bonneville shall be reserved for sale to public bodies until January 1, 1941. Public bodies and cooperatives are to be given every opportunity to perfect their legal organization and vote bonds and market them.

The policy of Congress is declared in section 3 to be the preservation of the preferential status of the public bodies and cooperatives and to give the residents of States within economic transmission distance of the Bonneville project reasonable opportunity to take any action necessary to become fully qualified purchasers and distributors of electric energy available under the act. Further, the Administrator, insofar as practicable, shall cooperate with States and public bodies and cooperatives within economic transmission distance of the Bonneville project to enable them to avail themselves of the preferential rights and priorities afforded by the act.

Section 4 authorizes the administrator to negotiate contracts for the sale at wholesale of electric energy for resale or direct consumption, provided that private persons or agencies other than privately owned public utilities are forbidden to resell electric energy to a private utility; contracts shall be for not more than 20 years, with provisions for equitable adjustment of rates not less frequently than once in 5 years, and in the case of a private utility contracts shall be cancelable upon 5 years' notice in writing if there is reasonable likelihood that any part of the electric energy sold under the contract will be needed for a public body. Contracts shall also contain stipulations concerning resale and resale rates to insure that the ultimate consumer shall pay rates which are reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

Section 5 prescribes that the administrator shall fix rates for surplus electric energy subject to the approval of the Federal Power Commission. If any rate schedule so submitted is not approved, then the Federal Power Commission may revise such schedules in conformity with standards prescribed by the act, and as so revised such schedule shall become effective. Rate schedules shall be fixed with a view to encouraging the widest possible use of electric energy, having regard, however, to the recovery of the costs of producing and transmitting electricity, including amortization of the capital investment, including interest over a reasonable period of years in order to distribute the benefits of an integrated transmission system and to encourage the equitable distribution of electric energy. The rate schedules may provide for uniform rates or rates uniform throughout prescribed transmission areas.

This is an important proviso because it contemplates and permits the establishing of certain rates within certain prescribed areas at and adjacent to the switchboard and also within prescribed transmission areas.

Section 6 authorizes the President to direct the holding of public hearings by an agency designated by him, to report to him by December 31, 1937, respecting any unreasonable discrimination against the Boulder Canyon project with respect to charges against power for construction costs, amortization, and interest. Subject to the approval of the President, the Secretary of the Interior shall make such changes as are recommended by the investigating agency notwithstanding the provisions of any other statute. Au-

thorization is also given for lump-sum payments to the States of Nevada and Arizona in lieu of payments now provided for by the Boulder Canyon Project Act. The Government is protected as to the payments to these two States because it fixes rates, and any deficiency in revenue to meet the payments may be covered in effect by surcharges upon rates otherwise appropriate. The seven States of the Colorado River Basin are interested in a "separate fund" which comes into existence only after the Government has been repaid in full. Prior to this time residual revenues, if any, after payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada, do not, under the Boulder Canyon Project Act or under this section, go into such fund, but are applied to accelerate amortization of the investment. Any rights any States may have are very specifically protected by paragraph (c).

Section 7 provides a method for purchase of supplies and services.

Section 8 directs the Administrator to keep certain accounts; authorizes certain expenditures and directs him to make an annual report to Congress through the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 9 authorizes employment of attorneys, engineers, and other experts and imposes civil service on the general staff.

Section 10 provides that all receipts from the Bonneville project shall be covered into the Treasury and sets up a continuing fund of \$500,000, subject to check by the administrator to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation. It also authorizes appropriation out of moneys not otherwise allotted such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

Section 11 authorizes the administrator to bring suits either at law or in equity and to be represented in all litigation by such counsel as he may select.

Section 12 is a separability clause.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that a rule can be secured in the very near future to bring this Bonneville legislation before the House for consideration, in order that the proper and necessary administrative facilities may be provided and ready to function as soon as the power is available for transmission the latter part of this year.

DEDICATION OF CHAPELS AND OTHER WORLD WAR MEMORIALS IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, of Public Resolution 45, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the delegation to attend the dedication of the chapels and other World War memorials erected in Europe the following Members of the House of Representatives: Mr. HILL of Alabama, Mr. LAMBETH, and Mr. EATON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the bill H. R. 7562, which has to do with farm tenancy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FILM AT LA FOLLETTE CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE SHOWS MURDERS OF PICKETS IN CHICAGO

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I was a little late getting here, and the reason is because I just viewed a film over in the Senate caucus room, before the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee, showing the killing of pickets near the steel plant over in Chicago. This was one of the most uncommonly brutal things I have ever seen in my life.

It showed an attack made entirely by the police.

And not a single policeman was hurt in this attack.

Ten of these workingmen were murdered by the police at that time.

After these men were on the ground and the crowd dispersed, the picture showed a policeman walk over and coolly

beat a prone man over his head and several of them seen to have been killed after the crowd had been dispersed, and the people were lying on the ground. This was in sound, and the facts are such that no one in the United States of America can in any way doubt the cold-blooded murder of 10 men.

It will always be known as the shame of Chicago. It will always be known as the shame of America, and one of the most shameful occurrences in the history of any civilized country.

Yes, in America today there is violence and talk of violence; one Congressman is so excited he speaks of civil war, and the old cry of communism is ripping through the air again.

TWO GIGANTIC FORCES OPPOSE EACH OTHER

Unquestionably two gigantic forces are at war with each other.

One, the great industrialists and those big-business men who refuse to recognize organized labor or collective bargaining.

The other force includes the American people who want economic justice, who want collective bargaining, and who, by the way, are now successfully organizing in great labor unions.

We Democrats were elected by that latter group—the farmer, the worker, the average American, the ordinary businessman, and I propose that we keep our promises.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AT MADISON SQUARE GARDEN

Can we forget the Madison Square Garden speech of the President? That is still a burning political document, and it was in his heart then, and it is in his heart now. He called the roll that night, and I hope the roll is called again, so everyone can know on which side we stand in reference to democracy and the accomplishment of our ends.

You remember he said:

Never before in all our history have these forces been so united against one candidate as they stand today. They are unanimous in their hate for me—and I welcome their hatred.

And now today the forces of reaction and privilege are at it again. We need not forget either the Democratic platform, in which we promised a square deal to the farmer and the laborer, the tenant, the youth; also we promised the preservation of civil liberties.

CONTROVERSY OF SECRETARY OF LABOR; GOVERNOR DAVEY

Now, Mr. Speaker, on June 28 Mr. Cox, the gentleman from Georgia, made a speech denouncing the Secretary of Labor in connection with the C. I. O. It was a bitter attack, quite unfair, and I believe that it was wholly unwarranted, and without any basis whatsoever, with the possible exception of a bare statement by Governor Davey, of Ohio, that the Secretary of Labor said she wanted Tom Girdler kidnaped. The charge by Governor Davey sounds like the story of an excited and imaginative child.

But the gentleman from Georgia said as follows:

While we did not need this statement to know that the Secretary approves of the use of violence under some circumstances, we were not prepared to expect the advocacy of duress and extortion from one standing so high in the service of the Government.

And in addition to this, the gentleman from Georgia said something about being led into the very heart of communism. He wound up his speech by saying:

This is no time for the suspension of public laws.

I agree that this is no time for the suspension of laws. But the truth is the Secretary of Labor suggested the use of the public law of Ohio; Governor Davey refused and let the steel companies have their way.

LAW OF OHIO PROVIDES MACHINERY OF PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

The law of Ohio provides for the calling together of the participants in a strike or industrial dispute if the Governor cares to do so. The purposes are legal, constitutional, and proper; they provide the peaceful machinery of settling strikes.

The Secretary of Labor requested this in connection with the attitude of the steel mediation board, which reported as follows:

We cannot but believe that the bitterness and suspicion which separate the two sides would be allayed by a man-to-man discussion around the conference table, and that the only hope of settlement lies in such a meeting.

Mr. Speaker, it was the steel company, not the union, that refused a meeting; and there is no reasonable evidence whatever that the Secretary of Labor suggested anything even of an unwise nature; everything points to the fact that what she tried to do was quite sensible.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman believes what he said is true, he should bring impeachment charges on this floor.

NEWSPAPERS SHOW BETTER NEWS TODAY

Mr. Speaker, it looks pretty dark, but I want to call attention to the press today. I did not even know it, but Labor, the railroad magazine, which is very conservative, stated, "Rail strikers are standing firm." The C. I. O. has appeared to have the spotlight, but it seems even the railroad men are having their troubles and standing firm.

In the Philadelphia Record, which is a consistently liberal newspaper, are words of advice to labor, and labor is somewhat criticized, which shows that they are being unbiased about it, because they are friendly to labor.

The New York Times states that in the report the companies are criticized, not the strikers and not the C. I. O. That also is a conservative newspaper.

Then we see in the Washington Herald, "Thousands return to Inland under truce. Youngstown mills plan to reopen."

In the Washington Post appear these words, "Steel firms bar peace by C. I. O. stand, say arbiters."

Then, the Herald Tribune, of New York, states that Governor Townsend, of Indiana, is nearing a strike truce for Youngstown's Indiana mill.

The Sun, of Baltimore, shows that the police fired on the strikers in Chicago, and on the editorial page appears a criticism of police brutality. Then it is stated that a policeman defined a Communist as a man who "is here to undermine the Government and to assault policemen." This was the excuse for murdering those people.

CIVIL WAR, AND THE FLOWER OF SOUTHERN MANHOOD

Concerning the general situation and Mr. Cox, the gentleman from Georgia, on Wednesday, June 30, he made another speech about the C. I. O. It was hysterical; to me it seemed highly provocative and one calculated to bring bloodshed and disorder. He started talking about civil war and ended talking about civil war. On behalf of the South he spoke of havoc, bloodshed, and loss of lives—then he warned the Committee for Industrial Organization that they will be met by the flower of southern manhood and they will reap the bitter fruits of their own folly. He did not say specifically, but it means nothing else to me, that he warns this organization, should it come into the South, that their mere coming in will mean that their constitutional rights of organization and collective bargaining will be denied, and that, as he says several times, there will be bloodshed and civil war. It is not exactly an engraved invitation to revolution and civil war, but in uttering such words, in advocating things of that kind, irreparable damage is done to the South and to the Nation.

Also Negroes are brought into the argument. I will not argue on such an emotional subject; but when the bloody shirt is waved, not by a northerner but by a southerner, when to that is added a cry about carpetbagging expeditions, it sounds more hysterical than ever. Mr. Speaker, we cannot solve our problems in the South by shouting about carpetbaggers or suggesting civil war to meet labor organizers with the flower of southern manhood.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND SOUTHERN WORKERS ALREADY ORGANIZED IN TEXTILES

And it might interest the gentleman and the country to know that 150,000, principally young women, have been organized in the textile industry in Georgia and other Southern States. The organizers were southern men, whether the flower of southern manhood or not I do not know.

To say the least, none of the flowers who are now in Congress—North, South, East, or West—will shed any blood in

any conflict. As for the South, it is a part of the United States, and its people are ready and willing to assume the burdens of any other States. What the flower of southern manhood needs is jobs, and not civil wars, or shooting scrapes indulged in as or by vigilantes. [Applause.]

WE NEED COOL HEADS, SETTLEMENT, AND MEDIATION

This, my friends, is not just an attack on Mr. Cox. It concerns our great problems today, and now I call for cool heads, I plead for peace, and I ask that there be adjustment, settlement, conciliation, mediation.

Oh, I laugh sometime at the language used by some of our conservatives. Sometimes I am called a left-winger, sometimes a liberal, sometimes worse; but who is calling for blood and violence? Why, gentlemen, they are those who prate about the preservation of the Constitution, those who carry their patriotism on their sleeves, the ones who call themselves conservatives and wrap themselves in the flag.

Has any one of these so-called conservative gentlemen cried out about the 10 men murdered on Memorial Day in Chicago by the police? No; not one. That was one of the bloodiest and most shameful pages in American history, as I said in the beginning of my speech. Ten men murdered, shot down, and of the 10, 7 shot in the back. But no leading conservative denounced it; none of those proclaiming their own patriotism had a word to say; it was similar to England when they began shooting down our American forefathers. The Boston massacre was nothing by the side of it. And that massacre caused the American Revolution.

TORIES OF ENGLAND, NOT AMERICANS, CAUSED REVOLUTION

While we are discussing this, let us be fairly mindful of history. Who caused the American Revolution? Why, the conservatives, gentlemen, the good, self-satisfied, well-fed, smug conservatives of England—men who were too stupid to see that they were forcing the Revolution on the American people. They would not even listen to pleas for conciliation. American radicals did not cause the Revolution; remember that.

What about the last Civil War—I say “last”, for the gentleman seems to want to call out the flower of manhood of the South for another—who caused that one? Was it the Negro slaves? No! It was the conservative elements, the people who owned property and slaves, both North and South. And what led to the war, what made it inevitable, was that reactionaries washed their hands of any settlement, refused to go through with any settlement or adjustment, and let the Supreme Court run over the people of the United States.

Today, my friends, it is the same old thing: thoughtless people are yelling their heads off and, for exercise, praising the Supreme Court and denouncing Communists, refusing peaceful settlement, and in effect urging violence.

Yes, my friends, you can read in the paper this morning that the entire blame for the steel situation was the companies' and not the men's. The report said, among other things, that settlement could not be reached, “in view of the attitude of the companies, that it could not accomplish anything further by way of mediation.”

Note it said “attitude of the companies.”

This report was signed by Charles P. Taft, a Republican, and the son of a great Republican President; Lloyd K. Garrison, and Edward F. McGrady, both of whom, though friendly to labor, are known to be reasonable men. Furthermore, Mr. Lewis agreed to withdraw entirely after he had been objected to, but the companies still refused to mediate.

PEOPLE WANT ORGANIZATION, ECONOMIC JUSTICE, AND LIBERTY

Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to this question, and certainly we as Members of Congress need not be extremists.

I am not impressed by the wild shouts of some of my colleagues on the Republican side. But I am disappointed that a Democrat, a gentleman from the South, a conservative, should act in such a manner. Talk no more about the violence of the actions of the radicals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the first part of my speech I mentioned the fact that we have two great forces at work today. I have already mentioned them; first, the great industrialists

who want Congress to go home, abandon its duties, and leave the country in anarchy with none of our promises kept; in this way they can handle strikes, blood or no blood, and as they please. So I say let us stay here and finish our job.

But the other major force, my friends, is the great mass of the American people. They want to organize themselves; they want to have collective bargaining; they want economic justice and liberty; they want purchasing power. And what have they gotten? So far not much, and they have been kicked around, abused, and murdered and killed and beaten, both by the regular police, and by company police, and by private armies, hired thugs, labor spies, ex-convicts, and plain private murderers.

But all this brutality is ignored by our pious, patriotic talkers, and instead they yell and shout about communism.

CRY OF COMMUNISM IS GETTING THIN

Oh my colleagues, the old cry of communism is getting very thin. It gets thinner and thinner; it answers no argument; it reveals no facts; it settles no problems. Now, let me talk about John L. Lewis.

In the speech of the gentleman from Georgia and in most of the talk nowadays we hear John L. Lewis! John L. Lewis! Communistic cohorts! Civil war! Communism! Communism! Communism! Red flag of Russia!

I repeat, shouting ugly words will settle nothing. Let us quit using all these meaningless but mean and nasty words and get at our problems.

I said this was a movement, this labor movement, the movement of C. I. O. It is not just John L. Lewis. If John L. Lewis were not in it, there would still be a movement. And whatever John L. Lewis does, wherever he goes, even if it is to the North Pole to stay there with the bad, bad Communists of Russia, the movement will go on.

My purpose is not to praise John L. Lewis, although it is generally recognized he is an abler man than other leaders. I am merely saying this is a movement and, as far as I can see, a valid American movement.

As for communism, I see no evidence of those tendencies in the C. I. O. All I see are strong-minded men who want their American rights. I would like to know when it got to be that a native-born American, born in the hills of Tennessee or the plains of Texas, got to be a Communist because he got up and kicked and demanded a square deal for himself and his family?

MOVEMENT HAS RIGHT TO EXIST UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Let us see whether this movement has a right to exist. Under the Constitution, the people have a right to organize. They have organized, and, under the same Constitution and the laws of this country, these people have demanded collective bargaining. But the National Labor Relations Board of the United States Government is criticized in a scurrilous manner and accused of partisanship. They are accused of not having fair elections.

Oh, that is absolutely unfair. Before the sit-down strikes the employers refused absolutely to follow the Wagner law. They refused even to permit the workers to have an election. These big industrialists got out injunctions, some 80 or 90 of them, against the Labor Board. And now all the hate of this crowd is directed at the Board, because even the Supreme Court has validated the Wagner Act, which includes the Labor Board.

HYSTERICAL FIGHT TALK ONLY LEADS TO TROUBLE

But the gentleman from Georgia, in his speech, speaks of the “basest emotions and grossest motives” in connection with the labor movement; he says there shall be no “compromise” he says the movement should be “sternly curbed.”

But all of this hysterical fight talk leads only to trouble. I call upon my colleagues, I call upon businessmen everywhere, and to the American people to use moderation, to attempt peaceful settlement, to attempt conciliation, to uphold the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

Now, those interested in business, listen to me. I served in a Colorado regiment. Before I had arrived it had done strike duty. It served in the terrible bloody affairs around

Ludlow. And I have talked to the owners, and especially one owner of the big coal mines there, and it has been found that if the mines had given every single demand of the workers the owners would have saved money. Millions were spent on the militia; more millions were spent on private armies, mine guards, and thugs. Today, 23 years later, Colorado has not paid all the money she spent on that bloodshed and murder.

TOM GIRDLER IS NOT A GOOD BUSINESSMAN

So when a contemptible character like Tom Girdler comes to Washington, in effect refuses to bargain collectively, insults the Congress and wisecracks about his deathly job—he is, besides being a brute, a poor businessman.

Listen! The workingman of America is not a Communist, he is not a coward, and he is not a sheep. Treat him half right and he will work himself to death. Let us, as free men, demand peace, condemn violence, whether it be perpetrated by organized industry or organized labor. But let us not get violent ourselves. Let us demand that all parties respect the National Labor Relations Act, which we ourselves passed, and which has been held constitutional by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I have said about all I care to say about the labor situation, at least in reference to charges and the general situation of violence. But let us Democrats talk politics a little. We are not a labor party, nor a farmers' party. We are an American party devoted to democratic government. But labor and farmers certainly were a major factor in putting us in office. These groups deserve to be recognized, not altogether because we obtained substantial support from them, but because they are entitled to justice.

LOSS OF LABOR OR FARM VOTE WILL DEFEAT DEMOCRATS

And if we as a party lose the support of labor in 1938, we will lose heavily in the elections. If the support is lost in 1940, it is likely that we will lose the majority, and surely the Presidency of the United States. On the other hand, if we should lose the support of the farmers, the result would be the same. We cannot afford to lose the support of either.

And I admit that the constantly misleading and unfair attacks on labor have caused some impatience among the farmers. What, then, should we do? The answer is that we should keep our promises to both groups, enacting minimum-wage and decent labor legislation, and at the same time fair legislation for the farmers and tenants. It is our duty to keep up the purchasing power of both and to protect their rights.

But equally important are several other pieces of legislation, such as a tax bill to close up the loopholes and provide for those to pay who can afford to do so; there is the matter of a great housing program, which we have promised over and over again, and now for nearly 5 years.

There is another thing. I am more convinced than ever that we must enact legislation providing for the reform of the judiciary. It does not alone concern the Supreme Court, but many other features of importance. If I am any judge of the American people, they favor the reform of the judiciary, and want it done before we adjourn this session.

And something more. You can say what you please, President Roosevelt is still the most popular man in the United States. [Applause.]

Surely the Madison Square Garden speech, the Democratic platform, still means something to us. More than the matters we have mentioned, there are still others equally important; these include widening the scope of the Social Security Act and old-age pensions. We must give attention to flood control, prevention of soil erosion, reforestation, and the establishment of the bill for eight T. V. A.'s provided in Senator NORRIS's bill, and as also suggested by the President. All of these things must be done this term.

NATIONAL PROGRAM—KEEP PROMISES—NO SECTIONALISM

Fellow Democrats—and now I am speaking only to Democrats—there is little chance of the Republicans coming back. They have no program. Their only program is to try to break down our program. And I believe that even if we, as a party, should suffer defeats, the Republicans would not

return to office. What would happen might be that no party would obtain a majority and we would have three or four political parties, with the election of the President thrown into the House of Representatives.

The only answer is that the Democratic Party should stick together, permit no sectionalism to enter its counsels, and not break apart; and, to repeat, stand by our national program and keep our promises.

I call upon you, upon businessmen, upon laborers and farmers, and upon all Americans for calm heads and reasonable action, for patience, peace, and kind thoughts. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia that, under previous order of the House, other Members are entitled to the time. If they will yield to the gentleman for that purpose, the Chair has no objection.

Mr. COX. I would like to inquire of the other gentlemen if they will yield for that purpose?

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object, because the gentleman had his time the other day, and he can get time after we are through.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business is completed and any special orders on Tuesday next, I may have permission to address the House for 1 hour on the subject of the revenues of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders of the day today I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to talk at all on the subject mentioned in the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], but I cannot refrain from expressing just a few thoughts on it. A few days ago our splendid Speaker recited a part of that wonderful poem by Edward Markham, *The Man With the Hoe*:

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned a brother to the ox?
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?

Later on in the poem Edward Markham charges the leaders and the rulers of that day and of the days of the past with bringing the man with the hoe to the condition in which we find him. This applied, of course, more in Europe than America, and it was in line with the picture of Millet, of France, that the *Man With the Hoe* was written; but to a certain extent it is becoming true in our own country, because we are tending toward tenancy on our farms, and this is a very dangerous tendency. It also applies in industry and has applied for decades. All that I want to say is that the employers in the past decades by sowing the wind are now reaping the whirlwind, and you and I have to take the consequences with them.

What I shall say today with reference to our Federal Government and the courts is something that I have thought about for years, and these opinions I have held for the last 15 or 20 years. It is not something new, but it is the basis on which I campaigned for Congress in 1920 and 1924 and was defeated. In 1932 I won, as I did in 1934 and 1936. So I

say to you, my friends, that this is not something new with me but it is a stand that I have taken for the last 15 years.

OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I do not come to you today to attack the courts. I merely want to limit them to their constitutional functions. I do not come to defend the President. He needs no defense; he can well take care of himself. I do not come to criticize Members of the House and Senate. I want to urge them to shake off the "inferiority complex" which too often grips them, assert their prerogatives, and perform their duties as the elected representatives of the people of the United States. We are members of an independent and coordinate branch of the Government. Let us assert our independence of both the other branches and at the same time show our willingness to cooperate with both for the greatest good to the greatest number. Thus shall we regain our own self-respect and deserve the respect of others.

I want to discuss with you this afternoon the three coordinate branches of our Federal Government and their functions. Not since the Dred Scott decision and the resulting Civil War which laid its devastating hand upon our country has so momentous an issue confronted the people of the United States as the one now agitating the minds of all Americans.

What is the real issue before us today? Stripped of its camouflage it is simply this: Shall we as citizens of a democracy insist that the three coordinate and separate branches of the Federal Government be limited to the functions expressly provided for in our Constitution? That great document is one of express powers as far as the Federal Government is concerned. The Supreme Court itself has so declared time and again. That applies to the judicial as well as the legislative and executive branches.

Now, what are the express powers of the three branches of the Federal Government? Congress is to legislate, to make the laws. This is expressly stated. Nowhere in our Constitution is there any authority for the judicial legislation to which we have been subjected for the past century. The President is vested with the power of executing the law, of administering the law, of carrying out the policies established by Congress. The judges are authorized to interpret the law, to try cases under the laws and the policies established by Congress. Not a word or sentence authorizes them to declare laws unconstitutional, to tear the laws up and throw them into the waste-paper basket. Indeed, the framers of the Constitution four times definitely refused them this power. It is an assumed, a usurped power, initiated by that great Chief Justice, John Marshall. Their duties are to interpret and apply the laws to specific cases, just as it is the duty of nurses to apply prescriptions to patients, not to tear them up.

If judges would confine themselves to these constitutional functions, they would find enough to occupy their time and efforts. They have tried more than 25,000 cases under the law during 150 years of our national existence. They have declared unconstitutional about 75 laws during that time. It is ridiculous to charge that we are attempting to destroy the courts when we merely want to confine them to their constitutional duties and to where their sphere of activities really lies.

The cry is often being raised that we are trying to destroy the Constitution. I deny this. We are insisting on going back to the original intention of the framers of the Constitution. Gladstone, of England, once said:

It is the greatest instrument struck off by the mind of man at one time.

It is a splendid foundation for our democratic form of government. Upon it has been erected a structure which is not only a source of admiration to the entire world, but also the everlasting refuge of a free people if it is interpreted in the light of modern conditions and amended when necessary. It is not sacred. Nothing is sacred except human rights and lives. The great Master once rebuked His persecutors when they chided Him because His disciples plucked grain on the Sabbath with these words:

The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.

I would paraphrase this by saying that "the Constitution was made for Americans, not Americans for the Constitution." Its very purpose is to protect all the citizens of the United States, especially the weak and helpless. Verily, I believe it is broad enough and comprehensive enough to provide for the modern needs of the people of the United States if interpreted by minds attuned to modern needs and necessities and equities.

To my mind the preamble is the alpha and the Bill of Rights—the 10 first amendments—the omega of the Constitution. Listen:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The preamble does not say "we, the Colonies", nor "we, the States." The sovereigns and final arbiters in this country are the people themselves. Who can better shape the policies most likely to assure them of these six provisions in the preamble, especially to "promote the general welfare", than their duly elected representatives in the House and Senate and in the White House—all responsible to those whose servants we are?

They call our splendid President a dictator. He is nothing of the kind. Nor has he at any time desired such a role. He has been chosen by the voters of this country twice by outstanding majorities to lead us not only onward to recovery but forward to permanent reform. We have delegated certain powers to this matchless leader, but we can at any time cancel those powers. And may I again reemphasize the fact that both of these branches of the Federal Government—the legislative and the executive—are responsible to their sovereign—the people of the United States. On the other hand, the Congress has for a century supinely submitted to usurpation by the Federal Courts of its constitutional prerogative and function of legislating without even a protest from these Members who now question not only the duty of the President to cooperate with the Congress for the common welfare but also the motives which actuate him in these worth-while endeavors.

Let us look at another phase of this question. Let us be practical. Are there not as able, efficient, and conscientious constitutional lawyers in the Congress as on the bench? Is not the Attorney General of the United States, the special adviser to the President as to the constitutionality of a law, as capable as our judges? Has the mere elevation by partisan Presidents to these positions made men, even such as you and I, infallible? When was Justice Shiras infallible—when he held the income tax constitutional or when, a few days later, he held it unconstitutional? When was Justice Sutherland infallible—when as Senator he supported a pension bill or as a judge he held it unconstitutional? When was William Howard Taft infallible—when as President he vetoed a bill as unconstitutional or later as Chief Justice he held the same law constitutional? When was Justice Roberts infallible—when he held a minimum-wage law unconstitutional or a year later when he held an identical law constitutional? The fact that one Federal judge in one district holds a law unconstitutional and a Federal judge in another district holds the same law constitutional also refutes the theory that judges are infallible. So also does the fact that we have 5-to-4 and 6-to-3 decisions. That merely goes to show that they have the same frailties, the same prejudices, the same reactions from early training and experiences as all the rest of us. Their decisions are made accordingly. But remember that we live in a democracy, and the Members of Congress and the President are responsible to the voters at stated periods, while the judges are not responsible to any voters at any time. The Federal courts are an irresponsible, permanent oligarchy composed too often of mediocre men. Such a state of affairs is not permitted even in conservative England.

Again let me call your attention to another anomalous situation. The Congress has the power—and has exercised

It—to create—to create, mind you—all the inferior Federal courts and establish, regulate, and limit their powers. Then we permit an insignificant Federal judge in some remote district to declare our own laws unconstitutional. The creation is master of the creator, is greater than the creator. This once happened in heaven, or was tried in heaven, and Lucifer was swept into the depths of utter darkness by his Creator for his impudence and audacity.

Congress has the constitutional authority to even abolish the inferior Federal courts. We do not propose to do this; they are both necessary and useful. But we do intend to limit them to the functions authorized by the Constitution, under which we both exist; that is, to try cases under the laws which we enact. They are to ascertain and preserve the rights of litigants who come before the courts for redress, but this must be in accord with the laws as enacted by Congress and signed by the President or passed over his veto.

I do not for one moment concede that the judicial branch of this Government is more capable, more desirous, more anxious to jealously guard and protect the rights of our citizens under the preamble and the Bill of Rights than are the Members of Congress and the President. As a matter of history, they have too often destroyed or interfered with human rights. I need only mention the results of the Dred Scott decision and the frightful holocaust it brought on this country. The child-labor decision doomed hundreds of thousands of helpless children to lives of drudgery, denied them their birthright to sunlight, fresh air, and education, and at the same time thereby denying willing laborers those jobs held by the children. The income-tax decision removed from the shoulders of those best able to pay the burden of taxation and placed it upon those whose burdens were already too heavy. And when, after 15 years, this was remedied by a constitutional amendment, the Supreme Court exempted salaries of Federal judges from the income tax on the pretext that under the Constitution the salaries of judges cannot be reduced during incumbency. In other words, the people themselves cannot by a later amendment change their own Constitution because the Supreme Court, forsooth, in a democracy considers itself even above the people themselves. The courts have also used and are using the un-American, unreasonable, undemocratic method of denial of rights by injunction. This prevents labor to bargain collectively and assemble peaceably.

Let me repeat that the Congress has exercised its constitutional prerogative to create all inferior Federal courts and define their duties and powers. It has also constitutionally both increased and decreased the membership of the Supreme Court. No one versed in our country's history can successfully deny this. No one can deny that the Congress has the constitutional authority to curb the powers of the inferior Federal courts and prohibit these courts from passing on the constitutionality of laws enacted by Congress. Then why this hue and cry about abolishing the courts, tearing up the Constitution, and destroying our democratic form of government? It is merely the echo of the superpatriotic barrage used against the administration in the last campaign. It will have the same outcome—a victory for the administration and for the American people.

I am for the President's program of court reorganization for three reasons: The Supreme Court has been rearranged by several former Presidents, including Lincoln and Grant; it is entirely constitutional, democratic, and American; it will permit the immediate carrying out of the mandate of the voters of the United States.

Did the people demand this? Let us see. During the first half of the Roosevelt administration the President proposed and the Congress enacted such legislation as the A. A. A., C. C. C., and T. V. A. The people as a whole favored this type of legislation. The New Deal was the issue in the 1934 campaign. Those of us who were in it know that full well. It won by a larger majority than in 1932, even though it was an off-year and the opposition was gathering strength enough to raise the cry of "Americanism." Following this election the Supreme Court declared most of these approved laws unconstitutional. The people knew where the President stood

on the New Deal and where the Congress stood—at least the Democratic candidates certainly did not say things about the New Deal that some of them are now proclaiming because they think it is safe and expedient. During the 1936 campaign the New Deal more than ever was the issue. If anyone is in doubt, consult the campaign material of those who so bitterly opposed the President. Instead of meeting the issue with arguments the New Deal was called communistic and subversive to our form of government. Most of our candidates were denounced as dangerous to democracy and pictured as tearing up the Constitution and destroying the last bulwark of civilization—the Federal courts. Does anyone seriously contend that the New Deal and its author was not the issue? What was the verdict of the American electorate? It resented the insinuations, it tossed the lying propaganda into the wastepaper basket and endorsed the New Deal and President Franklin D. Roosevelt with the greatest majority in the history of our country.

Now, how can the reforms and policies of the New Deal be carried out if the Federal courts are permitted to continue to declare these laws, enacted in accordance with the New Deal, unconstitutional? Oh, yes; now the opponents of the New Deal are for a constitutional amendment, which they just as bitterly opposed as long as it was expedient to do so. A constitutional amendment would require years to accomplish. This has been the case with the child-labor amendment. In the first place, it requires two-thirds of both the House and the Senate to submit an amendment. It requires three-fourths of the legislatures of the 48 States to approve an amendment. The big interests of the country, who bitterly oppose reform and permanent recovery, would use their influence and money on one of the branches of the legislatures of 13 small States and defeat any amendment. This would not be the democratic way of majority rule. One-twentieth of the population, if centered in those small States, could defeat the desires of the majority as expressed at the polls last fall. If there was no constitutional way of upholding the New Deal other than the amendment way, then it would be not only logical but also mandatory. But the voters expressed themselves at the last election. There are two ways in which their elected representatives may constitutionally carry out that mandate—that is, by increasing the membership of the Supreme Court or by denying the right of inferior Federal courts to pass on the constitutionality of acts of Congress. This is clearly within the Constitution, and hence is both proper and right. The people, by an overwhelming majority, approved the policies and the program of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and it is the duty of their servants in the House and the Senate to translate that mandate into realization by using the constitutional means to prevent the New Deal legislation from being emasculated by the Federal courts.

It is further charged that the present Executive will pack the Court. The present membership of the Senate will prevent the confirmation of any appointee who would be likely to place in jeopardy the lives or rights of any American citizen. I call your attention to the fact that, whereas it requires only a majority of the Senate to enact this proposed legislation, it will require two-thirds to confirm an appointment to any Federal court—an effective check, if one were needed.

It has become quite popular to speak derogatively of the President. For those who honestly differ with the New Deal, I have no criticism. But there are certain Senators and Members of the House who are now asserting their independence. They are no longer "rubber stamps." It is too sadly true that for several sessions they were nothing but "rubber stamps" because of the popularity of the President. They have confessed to it here on the floor of the House. Then they campaigned in 1934 and 1936 on one issue: Roosevelt and the New Deal—and won the election. But all the while in the cloak rooms they were sniping at the President and the New Deal because at heart they are reactionary. Now they are coming out more openly. Words are inadequate for the contempt I have for such men. They are not only disloyal to the President, but to the democracy of

Jefferson and to the United States. Frank and honest opposition is at all times a service, but "rubber stamp" support and hypocrisy are always a disservice and despicable.

We are still in the midst of the stress and turmoil of recovery from the depression and the reforms of the New Deal. We are a part of it and have a deficient perspective, so we can pass adequate judgment on neither the legislation nor the participants. A very substantial majority of the American voters have said in no uncertain terms that they want these reforms enacted into law and carried out. They have also chosen Franklin Delano Roosevelt as the leader for another 4 years. Majorities are not always right, but in a democracy their will must be respected and their desires carried out. They will be, notwithstanding conservative courts and reactionary Representatives and stand-pat Senators. If the New Deal fails of accomplishment within the next 3 years because of the obstructive activities of these three groups, the sovereign people will, I believe, draft this fearless leader for another 4 years, because he not only has broad sympathy for the common people but has the courage to fight for their rights.

I do not want to draft the President; it may not be necessary. It is unfortunate that this question has been raised at this time. But notice what I say: If by the obstructive activities of these groups the New Deal which the American people have demanded is not enacted into law, it may be necessary to have this fearless leader to continue to lead us to victory in the 4 years just beyond the present term.

Paul the Apostle, in his splendid chapter on charity (II Corinthians:13), when he had pictured charity as the greatest thing in the world, uses these words in the thirteenth verse:

And now abideth Faith, Hope, Charity—these three, but the greatest of these is Charity.

So some future historian of America will name three great Americans and write their names in letters of living light on the scroll of time—Thomas Jefferson, because he gave us political liberty; Abraham Lincoln, because he gave us human liberty; Franklin Delano Roosevelt, because he gave us economic liberty, without which political and human liberty are worthless—these three, but the greatest of these is Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I believe that some future historian will do this very thing; and I am here to say that although I have not supported the President in everything he has stood for—I have seen fit many times to oppose some of the things he has proposed—yet because of the fact that he believes in the common people and because he has sympathy for the common people and stands for the New Deal, which will give something to those who in past decades have received practically nothing, I am with him on the New Deal and all its principles to help those who have not received their rights in this country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the gentleman's argument that the Court should not review legislation passed by the Congress and his argument also relating to the power of the courts to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional. I am wondering with regard to the protection of the rights of the people under the Constitution if a State were to pass a law saying that within that State the amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators should be ignored and that in that State they would go back to the practice of electing Senators by vote of the joint houses of the legislature if we did not have a Supreme Court to say that such an act was unconstitutional, who would protect the rights of the people of the States to have a direct voice in the election of their Senators?

Mr. HILL of Washington. It is not necessary to answer the question, because I call attention to the fact that what I said had reference to acts of Congress. I did not mention

at all the acts of State legislatures. I am talking about acts of Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. All right. Then suppose Congress should pass a law and say that the Senators should be elected from among the States on the basis of population instead of protecting the rights of the Western and the small States, each to have two Senators. That was the compromise which made the Union possible originally. Suppose the Congress should pass an act and say that hereafter Congressmen are to be apportioned on the basis of population. Who would say that Congress did not have that right? Who would protect the rights of the States?

Mr. HILL of Washington. In the first place, I think the gentleman's assumption is far-fetched. I do not believe the Congress would do so, and the gentleman cannot cite a case where it has done so. In the second place, the gentleman and I are responsible to the people, and every 2 years we have to go back and be reelected. One-third of the Senators have to be elected every 2 years. The President has to be elected every 4 years. The people can remove us and put others in who will change the law. But the members of the Supreme Court and the Federal courts are put in there for life on good behavior, and the people cannot touch them. [Applause.]

My contention is that in a democracy the people should rule. They through their regularly elected representatives should decide on public policies. If we violate the confidence placed in us by the voters, they can remove us and change those policies by electing men and women who will repeal the objectionable laws. But when the Supreme Court, under our present unconstitutional system, declares that the income-tax amendment approved by the voters of this country does not apply to Federal judges, the people have no recourse. This is not democracy—it is government by an irresponsible oligarchy. I do not attack the courts. I hold no brief for the President. I do insist on the defense of democracy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under a special order heretofore made the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my friend from Michigan would be adverse to my asking unanimous consent that his time be extended 5 minutes, then yield me the 5 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it proper to state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has obtained permission to speak for 15 minutes immediately following the address of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to do that, but if the gentleman from Georgia would just as soon wait until I get through, I would appreciate it.

The SPEAKER. It is entirely proper for the gentleman from Georgia to submit his request, with the permission of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COX. I will not press the request further. May I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania at this time if he will yield to me to follow the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it will be my endeavor in the few moments I have at my disposal to follow the advice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], who said we should avoid the use of hard names, which advice I note he failed to follow during his talk.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has started out talking about personalities and states that I did not refrain from using hard names. I make that point of order at the beginning, because I do not think the gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the judgment of the Members of the House. The RECORD, if not deleted, will show the gentleman did, in substance, give that advice.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] wishes to complain of words spoken in debate, his remedy is to demand that the words complained of be taken down. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I most humbly apologize to the gentleman from Texas if I made an erroneous statement and if I am mistaken in the assumption that the name he called Tom Girdler was a hard one or if the term "murderer" is not a hard name. What is the reason for a strike?

WHY A STRIKE?

Common sense, clear thinking, consideration of the facts, should give a correct answer.

Is there any legitimate reason for a strike, other than that the workers whom it affects are dissatisfied with either the conditions under which they work, the hours of employment, or the wage received?

If the workers employed in a factory are satisfied, should an outsider complain? If an outsider is permitted to complain, cause a strike, close the factory, deprive the worker of employment, he should be willing and able to offer an alternative which would save the worker from loss. Usually, the outsider causing a strike, closing a factory, depriving the worker of his job, accomplishes little, if anything.

Under any system of free government, there is—there can be—no doubt about the proposition that workers have a right to strike. The exercise of this right may be fair or unfair; it may or it may not work hardship to coworkers. Nevertheless, the right to strike is the right of the worker, of which no one under a system of free government should dispossess him.

It must be equally true that the man who desires to work should have that right and of that right he cannot, if liberty is to exist, be deprived.

Do you question either one of these propositions? No one consistently can question either, for the striker of today may be the worker of tomorrow, and the man who desires to work today may wish to strike tomorrow.

If a strike is called, what is the procedure? There is no doubt about the fact that men in a factory may strike. Is it not equally true that a man adjoining him may desire to work? Is the right to strike to be placed above the right to work? Are they not equal, both before the law and as a matter of moral honesty?

What are the facts? The gentleman's argument might have carried weight had it been based upon fact, but unfortunately his argument was not based on facts. The gentleman cited the refusal of the owners of the plants to abide by the Wagner law and called attention to the fact that injunctions had been requested. That is quite true, and they were within their rights. I am sure that those gentlemen in this House who find so much fault with our Constitution and our courts would not close the doors of those same courts and deny the protection of the Constitution to the people who desired to have justice done. I step over the thought that the C. I. O. and these labor organizations have never to this day followed the law and asked for an election in the case of General Motors.

Never to this day have they invoked the law made for their benefit, devised for the advancement of labor and to assist it in organizing.

Let me state a hypothetical question. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] and I work at the same place. We are satisfied with working conditions, with hours, with wages. The other fellow, who is not employed at the plant, desires to organize us, charge us an initiation fee, a monthly fee. He convinces me that I should be organized; the gentleman from Texas is not convinced.

The other fellow and I insist that he join; he declines. We call a strike. I sit down on my job and on his job. I say he cannot work. I drive him from the factory, or, if it be a peaceful strike and not of the sit-down type, I picket the factory and when he leaves I will not permit him to return.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] has more fighting ability than have I. The other fellow sends in his flying squadron to join me on the picket line, and together we keep him, the gentleman [Mr. MAVERICK], from his job.

If the gentleman persists in his effort to go in, we either form a solid mass of humanity before the gate or we threaten. If threats are unavailing, we beat him.

The Government, State and National, gives the gentleman from Texas no aid. He is out of a job until he signs or the other fellow and I grow weary of our procedure, and, in the meantime, he is without work. He can live on his savings, if he has any. He can seek other employment, if he can find it, or he can go on the relief roll or depend upon the charity of the community.

I have stated the situation in the simplest of terms. Let the gentlemen who are speaking, who are organizers for the Committee for Industrial Organization, make answer in terms as simple.

Whether the majority of the workers in any particular plant, when free of intimidation, desire to strike, can easily be demonstrated by the methods employed in that particular strike.

If the majority of the workers are dissatisfied and wish to enforce their demands by a strike, and their demands are reasonable, the proposition is a very, very simple one. All they need to do is to call a strike, quit work, and advise the community and prospective workers of their grievances.

If their demands are reasonable, if their grievances are real, their places cannot and will not be taken by any self-respecting worker, and no longer can industry import strike-breakers.

If their demands are unreasonable, or if the majority prefer to work under the conditions and at the wages and hours which prevail, you will find the pickets reinforced by outsiders, using violence and intimidation to prevent the majority from working.

Let me repeat: The question of whether the majority in any particular plant desires to strike is answered by the character and methods of the pickets.

If outsiders are brought in and violence and intimidation used, then you may be sure that it requires intimidation and force to keep the majority from their jobs. Otherwise, they would stay away voluntarily.

The majority never need employ violence, intimidation, coercion. They can close the plant and keep it closed by remaining away from work. It is the minority which would violate the law, deprive its fellow men of the opportunity which it claims for itself, which ordinarily employs violence.

Labor should be organized, but only under responsible leaders, selected by the workers themselves. It should have the right to bargain collectively, and, when it assumes responsibility equal to the demands which it makes, public opinion, which is inclined to favor it, will compel compliance with all reasonable demands.

That there is intimidation, and plenty of it, is beyond question. Let me read excerpts from just a few letters. Here is one from Flint:

The citizens of this city are getting awfully sick of the C. I. O. rule and the union members themselves, in many instances, are beginning to rebel. To illustrate, a strike has been in progress at the Mary Lee Candy Shop on our main street for several days. Picket lines have been established around the front of the store and during the first few days the store did a bigger business than ever before. Finally the union officials became convinced apparently that there was a bad public reaction so they began calling customers who entered the store scabs and shouting that they would be awfully sick before night, indicating that the food had been poisoned. These lines were established at both the front and back doors of the store. Finally on Saturday the pickets began attacking customers who went into the store. Not satisfied with that they gathered a group of 50 or 60 hoodlums on the sidewalk, and when someone came along whom they knew as antagonistic, one of the hoodlums would push this person into one of the pickets who, then, would assault and beat up the passer-by. Then they would claim that the passer-by had assaulted the picket. One of the persons assaulted is a union man who is employed at the Chevrolet. Upon being assaulted he promptly knocked down the picket who had hit him. Thereupon 14 or 15 hoodlums began

beating this fellow up while the police stood by. Finally the police very gently told the hoodlums they should not disturb the peace.

Protest was made against this violence to the city manager of Flint, and, according to the Flint Journal of June 27, I quote:

City Manager Findlater having informed a group of downtown businessmen that the blame for the trouble rested upon the citizens of Flint, who, he said, had no business going into the Mary Lee Restaurant, or saying anything to the pickets who blocked the sidewalk in front of the place during the rush of downtown Saturday afternoon shopping.

The same paper gives instances of violence which occurred that afternoon and evening and which I will insert:

Men and women patrons of the restaurant were subjected to a running fire of verbal attacks and some fared even worse as they left the establishment.

Previously Betty Simpson, union organizer in charge of strike activities at the Mary Lee, was heard to inform the pickets and the crowd in front of the store that "the city manager said it was all right for us to go ahead and do what we wanted to do."

Most seriously beaten during the day was Mr. Miller, whose face was a mass of blood and bruises. He said he had just stepped out of the restaurant when he was set upon by five or six men who began to beat him.

Another who was attacked was Dr. J. W. Orr, who was kicked in the shins and struck in the face by a woman picket.

One uniformed policeman was on duty at the scene of the fighting when the Saturday afternoon disorders broke out and he was helpless to handle the situation.

An Associated Press dispatch from Massillon, Ohio, dated today, quoted Leo W. Cox, picket captain at Republic Central Steel division, as saying last night when he protested against the use of troops against the plant reopening:

If they try to open this plant they will have a damn bloody fight. We have more than enough men here to whip this army and the scabs, too.

That is a statement of a picket captain of the organization under whose auspices the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] spoke at Detroit when he advocated organizing in the South as well as in the North, East, and West.

Let the gentleman state on the floor of the House whether he stands back of massed picketing, whether he stands back of and approves keeping men by force from their jobs.

Here is a letter from the wife of a worker in the Chevrolet factory at Flint. It is dated June 28. Among other things, she wrote:

Our fair city has become a lawless place, indeed. Businessmen that have done much to make Flint what it is are being forced to sign up with the C. I. O. racketeers, but it is done only as a last step to save their business.

Don't think for a moment all those that belong to the C. I. O. do so by choice. The majority were driven to it.

I know men who have been beaten and called all manner of names because they find themselves the possessors of too much manhood to sign up with the hell-bent racketeers.

Our men are threatened with being dumped into compound tanks, etc., but, thank God, some have stood their ground. My husband had connecting rods brandished at him and was told to get to h— out of the Chevrolet or join the C. I. O.

The woman is frightened. She fears for her personal safety. Note this. She writes:

Today I stopped at police headquarters to make application to carry an automatic.

Think of it. Here is a housewife, a law-abiding, God-fearing, Christian woman whose husband is working for Chevrolet. Because of the acts of members of the organization for which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] goes to Detroit and speaks and of whose methods he has, so far as I know, on this floor uttered not one word of criticism, this woman appeals to the police department of her city, which has failed, even during the daylight hours, to protect citizens of that town from violence on the public streets, for permission to arm herself so that she may walk in safety.

She writes further:

I just felt I had to write to say we want law and order, freedom of speech, press, and worship. What are our chances for having these?

John L. Lewis and his gang practice all manner of coercion to force his ideas on us. Will our Government rob us of the right to choose our own leaders?

Here is another received this morning from New York, which needs no explanation:

I am a C. I. O. who would like to leave the organization, and I know a few others who would like to do it, too; but we are afraid, for we know some of the others would smash us or do something dreadful to us. We work on fur in New York, and if we left the union we know we could get no protection from the Government, for, as that good old CARTER GLASS said, "We have no Government", now in some of the States since Roosevelt has been in, and so many Congressmen are afraid of him and Farley. I know that most of the C. I. O. men want to stick to John Lewis, but I am an American and so are some of my friends who want to leave the C. I. O., and we see things a little different from the others. We can see that most of the employers are decent men and fair and square. We can see, too, that we are not smart enough to invent anything and make a lot of money, and it is lucky for us that there are some smart men who can invent things and make money to pay us wages. And I and my friends don't believe in communism like most of the C. I. O. men do, for we can see that most rich men do better with their money than the politicians would do with it, for they would buy votes with it. I wish you would let all the Congressmen read this letter and put it in the papers, too.

During the last few months I have received hundreds of similar letters from widely separated sections in the United States.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] preaches peace, but the organization for which he speaks practices aggressive, lawless violence.

Is there any question about it? Do I wrong the gentleman? What are the facts? There is no mystery; there is no concealment. The record is open; all may read.

This series of strikes began in Michigan at Flint. Armed men invaded our State. By force they drove our workers from their jobs. They took and held possession of the factories. Does the gentleman approve of armed invasion? Does the gentleman advocate the driving of workmen from their employment, either by C. I. O. organizers and C. I. O. "flying quadrants", or by the armed forces of a State, merely because those who make the attempt threaten violence and bloodshed if their desire is opposed?

In those picket lines men walk elbow to elbow, hand on shoulder, and, by a wall of moving humanity, bar workers from entering. If that does not suffice, they arm and, by force, drive those who would work away from the factory gate. Does the gentleman approve of that? Is it right? Is it just? Am I overstating the situation? Have I described a condition which does not exist, which has not for months existed in many places throughout this land?

Yet the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] speaks for an organization which does these things, and on the floor of this House he praises the leader of that movement.

Let us say nothing about the law, about legal rights. As one man to another, I ask him to make answer on the floor of this House, when the time is convenient to him, whether there is either fairness or common decency about it, if, by force, I drive my fellow worker from his job and keep him from it?

The gentleman talks about brutality which occurred at Chicago, but he does not tell the whole story. Do not mistake me. I do not condone brutality under any circumstances. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that that Sunday's attempt, in which these men were killed and injured, was the fourth assault on that particular plant, and that all could have been avoided had peaceful, lawful picketing been the order of the day.

Those marchers when they started toward the plant knew that it was defended by Chicago police. Many of those marchers knew just the kind of a police force they would meet. They knew that bloodshed and violence would follow if they persisted. Yet they went on.

Pictures were taken. They may be accurate; they may not be accurate. It is said that one series of pictures was taken by a minister, who also was reported to have been present taking pictures at two other scenes of violence where strikes were in progress.

After one has seen some of the pictures shown in some of the movie houses he does not always accept the evidence of his own eyes. It is said that Joe Brown, in his new

picture, Walking on Air, I think it is, has airplanes climbing either trees or telegraph poles; in any event, doing the impossible.

One thing is certain—the investigation now being conducted by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee at the other end of the Capitol has not yet brought out, so far as I know, acts of violence perpetrated by strikers or “flying squadrons”; but, perhaps, I am impatient, and it may sometime get to it.

This fact I have noted, that whenever public sentiment is crystallizing against these unlawful activities, that particular committee creates a diversion. I cite as an example that when the citizens of Flint were about to drive the sit-down strikers out, according to the official publication of the C. I. O., the Senate committee came to its rescue by putting the “heat” on General Motors officials.

Do not go out now and say that I advocate or approve of violence by anyone.

I hold no brief for any man who wants to engage in violence. You cannot put me with that group which wants violence, which wants trouble, but you can put me with that group which is willing to defend its homes and its property and the people of its city.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just for a question.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Was not the gentleman going to lead an army into one of these towns?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have been waiting for that question, and I will answer the gentleman. The gentleman has asked his question; if I may have the floor again, I will make answer.

I would not lead an army anywhere if I could get out of it, and I never made any expression which indicated that I had the slightest desire to lead an army or to provoke a fight. I did make certain statements with reference to a condition which existed at Monroe, Mich. When I came through Monroe, after I had learned by a visit there what happened at Newberry, in the northern Peninsula of Michigan—and I thank the good Lord we have a Member from Michigan [Mr. Hook] who is standing and talking against this lawlessness—I was frightened; and I still am frightened. I saw businessmen, just as respectable as any in this House, who had been out on the highway for 3 nights and 3 days, with no more than 11 hours' sleep, protecting the factory, the workers; and I saw farmer boys and workers, young and old, and I was advised that they had the C. I. O. membership list, and that out of 1,358 workers only 99 wanted to strike—I saw these men out there, two veterans of the World War armed with “tommy” guns, others with shotguns, and others with rifles, baseball bats, and knives.

These men's faces were drawn because of fatigue, of hardship. They, too, were frightened because of what might come to their town; because of what had been said; because of what had been done; because of the threats which had been made against their city.

When on Sunday Bittner stood before an audience of 8,000 C. I. O. sympathizers and said to them, “We are coming back to Monroe”, and “By God, they will pay for what they did at Monroe, and pay well”, I did say, and I stand here now and repeat it, that I was willing to go to Monroe. I was willing to go armed, and to have my friends and relatives go armed, to assist the citizens of Monroe in defending themselves against armed invasion from other States and other cities under the leadership of the organization for which the gentleman speaks.

In spite of the uncomplimentary intimations of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK], and of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNELL], and of my own timidity, when armed workers and men come in from outside, from Chicago and from Toledo, and threaten violence; when they march upon the defenseless towns and cities of my home State, I am willing to do something besides talk.

I believe that nine-tenths of the Members of this House are willing to go back into their own States, to fight if neces-

sary, when their communities are threatened with that kind of an invasion.

The gentleman stated no blood would be shed by any of these men who were doing the talking here. Now, you talk about John L. Lewis. You speak for his organization, as you did at Detroit. Bring John L. Lewis, or whomever you want to bring; bring him over into our community with those fellows, and, brother from Texas, I will be there to meet you and your friend John. Do not forget it. This is not a threat; it is just a promise I am giving you.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Will the big brave man from Michigan have a gun?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not a big brave man. I am the biggest coward in this House. I will run faster and farther and crawl into a smaller hole than any Member of this House to get out of trouble; but do not come to my house and tell me you are going to put me out. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have yielded all the time I care to yield to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Do not think I am the only one who sees trouble ahead. It is always the troublemakers who cannot see it. It is the fearful man, the cowardly man, the man who is afraid, as I am afraid, who fears what is coming. For myself I do not care. I am old enough to call it a day. I have had my share of work and I have had my share of pleasure; but I have children and I have grandchildren. Now, come on, if you insist. That is all I can say—come on—and if you expect that because Lewis, whose telegram preceded the beating, shooting; and hanging of 25 defenseless men at Herrin in 1922, can get away with those methods, make no mistake. You will find factory workers, businessmen, farmers, men old and young—yes; and women—of the rural communities of Michigan ready to do battle; ready to do battle not because they wish it but because it is forced upon them and they cannot evade it. They will fight for home and fireside because they must, not because they wish.

And let the C. I. O. organizers remember that no magic mantle surrounds them; that they are not immune from those things which affect others.

Peaceful we are, and peaceful I am, and I will go to the end of the road to avoid trouble; but when driven to the end of the road and nothing is left—and C. I. O. would leave us nothing—we can do naught but defend ourselves, and that we will do.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. What do you mean by “come on”?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I mean this: Get those gangs of whatever they are—

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. You are not inviting me outside or anything?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; that is the last thing I would think of. If I were inviting anyone to a physical combat, I would try to get the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON] or the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], or some big man like that, or, perhaps, if I had the money, I would get Joe Louis to do my fighting. That is the way I would try to handle that kind of situation. [Laughter and applause.] But invade our homes, and we will do our own fighting. If and when you come to my home, you will find me there. Do you think I am crazy, do you think I am alarmed? I know I am frightened.

What about the kindly, patriotic, courageous gentleman over on the other side, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who said the other day, June 24 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6284):

We have no Government.

What about the statement of the Democratic whip in the Senate, Senator LEWIS, who said, on June 23 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6213):

This Nation is in a great peril, as I see it. I behold America as it now stands upon the eve of a turbulence which can result in a conflict inwardly very similar to that which preceded the Civil War between the States.

There is not a State in our Union which just now is not threatened with what may be called a form of riotous confusion.

Shall we overlook at this time and forget that it was in like manner that Italy yielded, bringing on a condition which has finally resulted in a tyranny and a form of despotism we shrink to mention? Shall we refuse to reflect that our affairs of state and industry may likewise become victims as was the case in Italy, Russia, and now in Spain?

Here within ourselves we are nearer to insurrection and apparently, sir, confronting an army of revolt in the largest numbers.

Oh, yes, I may be crazy; but those two patriotic Senators who have lived long enough to judge coming events, they are not crazy. They know what is going to happen if this continues.

When peaceful, law-abiding, God-fearing and God-worshipping housewives in Michigan are so frightened that they find it necessary to arm themselves, in order that they may have protection in daylight on the streets of a city in Michigan, then it is time that we take action to dispel their fears, to bring them security, for fear leads to violence, and violence, when widespread, to insurrection and civil war.

That seems to have been the thought in the minds of the two Democratic Senators to whom all look for sound advice and courageous action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order heretofore made, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to recognition.

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have 15 minutes of additional time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is loathe to submit that request, because the House has granted permission to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to address the House, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania may yield for the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BEITER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

(Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. MAVERICK asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I understood that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD] asked unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be given 15 minutes of additional time. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to postpone my time to see whether the House is willing to give the gentleman from Michigan the additional 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] objected to the request, in any event.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD] submitted the request, it was my understanding he wanted 15 minutes. I would not object if the gentleman wanted 5 minutes. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] has been trying to get the floor for some time, and I would like to hear the gentleman's statement. I have no objection if the gentleman from Michigan wants that additional time.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is willing to waive the time heretofore accorded him, the Chair would entertain a request that the gentleman from Michigan be allowed to proceed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that I would give up my time?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be deferred.

Mr. RICH. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I am asking that my time be deferred.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time heretofore granted him may be deferred pending

the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD] that the time of the gentleman from Michigan may be extended 15 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I take no particular exception to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] had to say about me. I want to think better than well of the gentleman. However, it would be difficult for me to esteem him as highly as he might wish. I do want to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman loves his Government and would not willingly lend himself as an instrument to its overthrow. I want to believe that the gentleman feels as Andrew Jackson felt when he said, "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved", and as Daniel Webster when he said in his Bunker Hill address, "Our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country." Then I want him to join with me in asking the question, "Where is the coward or the scoundrel who would not fight for such a beautiful land?" [Applause.]

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I must believe that the gentleman is never serious; that he is more interested in provoking amusement by his extravagance and buffoonery than in the molding of sound public opinion.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands that the words of the gentleman from Georgia be taken down. The gentleman from Georgia will take his seat.

Which words does the gentleman ask be taken down?

Mr. MAVERICK. Where the gentleman used the word "buffoonery." This is not very serious to say it; we have said worse.

The SPEAKER. The reporter will take down and the Clerk will report as soon as convenient the last paragraph of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

I must believe that the gentleman is never serious; that he is more interested in provoking amusement by his extravagance and buffoonery than in the molding of sound public opinion.

The SPEAKER. What action does the gentleman from Texas desire taken on the words of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I believe—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must make some affirmative motion.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the words be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the words uttered by the gentleman from Georgia are such that it constitutes a matter which the House should determine as to whether or not they should be stricken from the RECORD.

The gentleman from Texas moves that the words uttered by the gentleman from Georgia be stricken from the RECORD.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present. They can put this on record if they want to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. I understand that the gentleman simply made a point of order that there was no quorum present; that is, he did not object to the vote on that ground. I wanted to know whether it was just an ordinary point of no quorum or whether the gentleman objected.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was presumed that that kind of language was in violation of the rules of the House. If it is not, let it go.

The SPEAKER. It is not within the province of the Chair to strike language from the RECORD. That is a matter that must be submitted to the House.

Mr. MAVERICK. I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker say that was in violation of the rules of the House to use that kind of language.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled that the language of the gentleman from Georgia was of such nature that it should be submitted to the House whether or not it should be expunged. The gentleman has other remedies. The gentleman could have moved that the gentleman from Georgia should be directed to proceed in order, but the gentleman has moved that the words be stricken from the RECORD, and that issue must be submitted to the House.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAVERICK. I would like to know what is to be done when personal remarks of that kind are made?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has availed himself of his parliamentary remedy. He has asked that the words be taken down and has moved that they be stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whether or not business has been transacted since the gentleman from Texas raised the point of no quorum.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, it is not an important matter, so I will withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia will proceed in order.

Mr. COX. I want to think that the gentleman believes in some form of government, that he has not become wholly Russianized, and that John L. Lewis is not in fact his candidate for the Presidency in 1940.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the word "Russianized", and I again ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman request that the words be taken down?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the word "Russianized" be taken down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "Russianized."

Mr. MAVERICK. It is nice of the gentleman to withdraw his words; such words are only meant to be insulting; they mean nothing and prove nothing. And as for the gentleman's remarks that John L. Lewis is my candidate for President in 1940, I have not decided. But I will not do like the gentleman—say I am for Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, and then be against both. I was for Roosevelt and the Democratic Party in 1936, and I am now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the word objected to.

The Chair thinks it proper to restate the rule of decorum in debate:

That no word should be spoken that reflects upon the character or reputation and standing of any Member.

The gentleman from Georgia will proceed in order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am willing that the gentleman shall be known to his brethren as he desires to be known; and, therefore, I propound to him now a few questions which he can answer later on:

Is the gentleman collaborating with Mr. Lewis in the shaping of his official conduct here in this House?

Is he in sympathy with the C. I. O. and its effort to terrorize industry?

Does he favor the sit-down strike?

Does he approve of armed picketing?

Does he favor the closed shop and the check-off system?

Does he favor the forcible closing of industrial plants, the denial of ingress to owners, the denial of food and raiment to thousands of people who want to work?

Does he favor the stoppage of the United States mails, the shooting into planes attempting to carry food to people who insist upon their constitutional right to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow?

Does he favor the denial of the authority of the courts, the resistance to peace officers, the use of dynamite in blowing up water mains, the forcing of thousands of people into the bread lines, and the shooting down of people who resist the appeal of the Communist?

Mr. Speaker, let the gentleman make serious answer to these questions, and his brethren and the country will know him as he is. [Applause.]

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be deferred 5 minutes in order that I may reply to the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to be recognized at this time for 15 minutes.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will not the gentleman defer for 5 minutes?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to secure time on various occasions. It is very difficult. I am perfectly willing, however, that the gentleman from Texas may answer the questions of the gentleman from Georgia. If my time may be deferred, I shall be perfectly willing to have him answer. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Just a moment. The Chair wants a definite understanding about the parliamentary situation. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield the time the House has granted him?

Mr. RICH. No; I do not, Mr. Speaker. I ask that my time be deferred 5 minutes in order that the gentleman from Texas may answer the questions of the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may now be recognized for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, it is the instrumentality of persons who wish to be insulting and embarrass others to ask insulting questions. It is like asking someone, "Have you quit beating your wife or robbed a bank lately?" "Have you cut a throat or scuttled a ship in the last 10 days?", or "Do you believe in cannibalism?"

I do not think that it is necessary for a soldier of the World War—and I am not going to brag about that—I do not think it is necessary to answer those questions; but I answer these insults, generally, by saying "No." That is the answer. I will not attempt a detailed answer, at least not now. For, after all, the gentleman from Georgia merely wanted the peculiar satisfaction of asking me those questions. The answers do not concern him greatly.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose violence of any kind, whether committed by industry or labor, and said so in my main speech. I am for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes and want to encourage the Secretary of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board; the gentleman has denounced both.

It seems to me as though the discussion of this whole C. I. O. and labor question is on a basis of the frightful suggestions in the nature of the conversation of the gentleman from Georgia. The very thing that he is doing here is the kind of psychology and the kind of excitement that brought on the Civil War in the United States. Such talk may cause trouble again. And it is easy to be brave here in Congress.

It is easy enough to propound insulting questions, but the problems which confront the American people are serious. I will not rise and protest my virtue, that I am as virtuous,

or as brave, or as courageous as the gentleman from Georgia. Portia protested her virtue too much, and Falstaff talked bravely and ran.

I cannot get up here and say that "the flower of Texas manhood", since the gentleman has spoken of "the flower of southern manhood", are going to do battle and shed some blood because of the C. I. O., especially since thousands of young ladies in the South have lately joined the textile union, and no one has risen up to stop it. The questions asked were intended merely for insult and display.

Some people become overpious, and they wrap themselves in the Constitution and the flag. They parade themselves.

But who is it that is fighting the plans of the Democratic Party and of the President of the United States?

Why, it is men like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

He is one of the men who does that very thing. I merely submit to the membership of this House that there are lots of men in the C. I. O. and other labor organizations who are just as patriotic, just as honorable, and just as courageous as the gentleman from Georgia.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that just such occurrences as of today bring violence. We have heard enough of bitter personalities for the time being. The people of this country would rather see us do our duty and carry out the promises of the Democratic Party. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] desire to avail himself of the time previously given him?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I do. I asked for it for the purpose of utilizing the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I state that I shall object to any further unanimous-consent requests at the termination of the gentleman's speech.

Mr. VOORHIS and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. RICH. If it does not come out of my time. I want to be as courteous as I can to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. It will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, then I cannot yield. I am awfully sorry. I have tried to be as courteous to the Members of the House as I possibly could in yielding my time heretofore.

Mr. COX. I want to thank the gentleman for his exceeding kindness to me.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is quite welcome.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the day during which we are having discussions among the membership of the House about each other and things that have been said on the floor regarding personalities. While on that subject I want to call attention to a statement made by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gildea] on June 21.

First, may I say I hold no ill will or animosity toward any Member of the House or toward any one in fact that I know of in Congress, in my district, in the State of Pennsylvania, or the world. We all have a right to our individual opinion and a right to believe in certain things as we please and to worship as we choose. Thanks for that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned something about the Woolrich Woolen Mills and the fact I was general manager of that concern; therefore he spoke of me personally.

May I say that I am a manufacturer and in business, and have been all my life since I left college. I consider it a distinct honor and a great privilege for any man to be engaged in some honest business in order that he may, during his life, do something not only for himself but for hundreds and hundreds of other people. It so happens I am associated with business that employs about 700 people. We try our best, so far as we possibly can, to look after those individuals and do the things that we think ought to be done for those employees. We work with them, we associate with

them, and we understand them, and they, I think, understand us. We have never had any labor trouble to speak of that was not satisfactorily adjusted to employer and employee. I question whether we have an annual labor turnover of the employees of our plant of 1 percent. Certainly not over that.

We believe in the Golden Rule. We may try to do everything we know how, but there arise in any plant differences between the employee and the assistant foreman, the foreman, or the superintendent, or the management; that is only natural. Naturally 700 or 800 people cannot always get along together 100 percent. The fact is you have to do the thing that may be best for the greatest number. If you have some people who will not work with you, there is only one thing for them to do, and that is to work for somebody else. If they cannot get along with a foreman or assistant foreman, they have to get out. You necessarily have to have your rules and regulations to apply to all. Business must be run on a sound basis. They must have rules and regulations just the same as the House of Representatives or any other body.

When it comes to minimum wages and the abolition of child labor and things of that kind, I am for those things 100 percent. Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have advocated those things. I have even gone down to the labor temple to get them to advocate such laws since 1930. The principal ones I found against those things are the men in the labor organization. With the exception of one man who has charge of the Federal Government employees, Luther C. Stuart, they were not for those things; at least, those I contacted in labor circles were not.

The gentleman stated that my company was called before the Wagner Labor Relations Board. Name some business that has not been called before them or who will not be. The right to labor is just as sacred as the right to strike for all Americans under our form of government. May that always be the case.

Since that Board has been established, under a law the intent and purpose of which was that the Board should settle strikes, we have had more strikes than we have ever had in the history of the Nation in the same space of time—over 2,400 in 7 months. I do not know where you would find a concern which has not been called up before that Board, because today, if one employee raises an objection for any reason at all to management, the C. I. O. is after him trying to get him to come to the Labor Board and make some objection about your organization, and they cooperate with C. I. O. 100 percent. The C. I. O., so I am informed, paid the expenses of three of our employees who were relieved from duty in our company in order that they might come here to Washington to make complaint. Nothing strange about that. Just facts. When the difficulties concerning those three employees arose, not one word was said about organization or about labor unions. Labor unions were not discussed, not even mentioned. I may say, too, that I am in sympathy with organized labor, and I am in sympathy with the right of labor to deal with its own employers.

For years the employees in the various departments of our company have elected their own representatives, every one of whom sits in on the monthly meeting of the foreman, assistant foreman, and the board of directors, taking care of the things which are interesting and vital to the welfare of such employees. These employees can make complaint at any monthly meeting about anything which goes wrong or anything which might happen concerning the employee and his welfare. This custom has been in effect for years. We have also had an old-age pension system effective for years. We have no child labor. It is outlawed in Pennsylvania, and has been for years.

I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gildea] that I now give him an invitation to come up to our plant and visit me, and go around and see the plant, and see the people, and how they live. He can talk to them at their work and at their homes, and see whether the people up there

are fairly well satisfied with their work. See if they are treated right, see if the great majority of them live right and happy and see what nice conditions they really do have and enjoy. I will venture the assertion you do not have a textile plant in Pennsylvania or the country that have all around working conditions as good or better than at Woolrich, where the people are happier and more contented, where they live in nicer homes, or where the surroundings are as good.

Mr. GILDEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. For just a question.

Mr. GILDEA. I simply want to make a statement regarding that invitation. I have been invited by the workers at the gentleman's mill to attend a meeting in Williamsport on next Wednesday evening. I intend to accept the invitation, and I shall report back to the House exactly what I find.

Mr. RICH. I suggest to the gentleman that instead of going to Williamsport he go to Woolrich, the place to see for yourself. However, when he does go to Williamsport at the request of Mr. Derr, the organizer for the C. I. O., who evidently is the man who invited the gentleman up there, to get his information, you will only get the C. I. O. side. Go to Woolrich and get the facts from the 95 percent of satisfied workers, all American born and all good American citizens. We have nothing to be ashamed of, but we have much to be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not yield any further. I have given the gentleman the invitation.

Mr. GILDEA. I just wanted to make that statement.

Mr. RICH. In reference to employees, I may say that some employees are not altogether physically well qualified or mentally well qualified to be employed in any plant. In a plant which employs many people there are those who must be looked after; they cannot take care of themselves. We have some employees in that category whom we have tried our best to keep from going on relief, and we have done everything we possibly could for them. None of our employees are compelled to buy merchandise, as was stated, from the store company. That is not a true statement; and we have a cash pay twice a month for employees who do not give orders for more than they make to be deducted.

In the turmoil which is going on in industry today it is not unusual to have someone try to raise trouble. This seems to be in line with almost all organizations and business people now. Just this morning I received a letter from the Eskimo Knitting Mills, a letter which no doubt all Members of Congress have received, together with an attached letter to the mayor of Philadelphia, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may insert these two letters in the RECORD at this point. Read these letters for your own enlightenment of what is going on in industry by the C. I. O.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

ESKIMO KNITTING MILLS, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1937.

His Honor the Mayor, S. DAVIS WILSON,
City of Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MAYOR: Being acquainted with your reputation for fair play, I am writing this letter to acquaint you with a situation which has been giving us and our employees considerable worry, and which condition, I am quite sure, you will want to use your good office to remedy.

This company has been in business approximately 30 years; during past 3 years the owners have been able to draw only \$30 to \$40 per week, while the wages paid to skilled labor, mostly women, average from \$30 to \$50 per week, and unskilled labor \$14 to \$21 per week.

The above can easily be substantiated and you can appreciate that in our anxiety to treat our labor as well as possible we have always been satisfied with less for ourselves. We have employees here who have been with us for past 8 to 18 years, and the relations between them and the owners have always been very pleasant.

About 4 weeks ago, and since then, almost three times daily, the Committee for Industrial Organization organizers come to our plant, causing considerable annoyance to ourselves and our employees, gathering large crowds and through the use of large amplifiers they started to threaten our employees. We have asked both members of the Committee for Industrial Organization and also

National Labor Board, in order to establish the desire of our employees as to an outside organization, to allow our employees to vote and decide for themselves just what they want to do, but we have been advised by the National Labor Board, due to no trouble at our factory, there is no necessity for a vote, and members of the Committee for Industrial Organization frankly advise that they must work on our employees for a while in an endeavor to get them to join their organization before they ask for a vote.

Meanwhile our employees in their desire to find out their own wishes have taken a vote between themselves, without our cooperation or assistance, and have advised us that approximately 90 percent are against an outside organization; and meanwhile they have formed an organization of their own. Some of the few people, 8 or 10 out of a total of 92, that the C. I. O. organization have been able to get have admitted that they have been scared into signing with the C. I. O.

Since the constant effort of the C. I. O. organizers during the past 4 or 5 weeks in an endeavor to get workers from our organization has not at all changed the decision of the large majority of our employees, who definitely refuse to have anything to do with the C. I. O. organization, we certainly feel that they and ourselves should be left alone to do our work in peace and without having to worry that someone will constantly annoy us on way home or on way to work and in the shops.

I believe that you feel like I do. If there was any dissatisfaction here, the majority of our employees, after constant grumbling by the C. I. O., would have certainly joined with them by now; and, if they have not, should establish definitely that they do not want to.

In view of these facts, or any investigation that you may desire to make, is it not fair to request your assistance in keeping members of the C. I. O. organization away from our shops and employees?

Thanking you for an early reply, I am,

Yours very truly,

ESKIMO KNITTING MILLS,
J. ROSENFELD, Vice President.

ESKIMO KNITTING MILLS, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 28, 1937.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,

Congressman from Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am attaching hereto copy of letter which we have written to the mayor of Philadelphia and which will give you a rather clear picture of the position which hundreds of employers of labor have been placed in with the passing of the Wagner Labor Act. Not that the Wagner Labor Act is giving outside organizations, such as the C. I. O., the right to resort to such high-binding methods, and acts bordering on anarchism, but the fact that it is designed to give the employer no protection at all has opened up a wonderful opportunity for unscrupulous attorneys and organizers who are taking advantage of it for their own personal benefit and not for labor.

It may surprise you to know that an investigator for the National Labor Board has given us to understand that it makes no difference how our employees feel about it, the policy of the Board is to foster the C. I. O. organization, and we have been advised by the investigator of the National Labor Board that the best way to save ourselves any trouble is to agree to negotiate with the C. I. O. organization.

Please bear in mind, here is a company whose employees are and always have been perfectly satisfied; 5 weeks of the most unusual threats and coercion by C. I. O. organizers on our employees, and by that I mean coercion of the most unscrupulous type, threatening the employees and their families in their homes, etc., has not changed the minds of our employees, and up to the present day they are still rejecting any advances made by members of this organization that unless we agree to deal with them and allow them to organize our shops they threaten to bring here a crowd of pickets, people not employed by us, and call a strike in order to force the employees to join the organization.

In other words, we are placed in a position where we must sell out our employees to the C. I. O. organization; we must tell 90 percent of our employees, unless they join the C. I. O. organization, they will be out of jobs. You can just imagine how little respect we will command from our employees who, after 5 weeks of threats and coercion by members of the C. I. O. organization, are still refusing to have anything to do with this organization; were we to advise them now they must join this organization, if we are to keep open and allow them to work, and please bear in mind the instructions I have from a governmental agency, such as National Labor Board, are that we do just that, that we sell our employees to the C. I. O. organization. I really believe that if those who are responsible for legislation made a study of this particular situation in our plant, then an unbiased committee would learn a great deal about the great danger done to both industry and labor by the Wagner Labor Act as presently constituted as well as the interpretation and administration of this act by the National Labor Board.

If you were to sit here with me in my office and meet some of these organizers, none of whom I have met so far could speak plain English, and probably most of them are not even American citizens, I say, if you were to sit with me and listen to these men order us in our own office that unless we turn our employees over to them they will close us up and put around our plant hundreds of pickets, not of our employ but paid pickets, probably people out of employment at this time, you would realize that the best

part of our time today cannot be given to proper management of our business or to obtaining sufficient business to keep our employees occupied, but it is given to defending ourselves against a host of anarchists who have been left to do as they please and who apparently will probably keep on doing it, for it is a profitable business for these organizers, until they are stopped by proper legislation and proper administration of such legislation.

I might say that we are heading for a new depression, a depression not caused by economic conditions but by uncertainty due to strikes encouraged by this new Wagner Labor Act and its administration. Large shipments of merchandise made by this company to wholesalers and retailers all over the country are being returned; it cannot be sold due to strike conditions, which means just this: that employees who have been working here steadily for 3 years will soon have to be laid off for lack of work.

Quick action is needed; a revision of the Wagner Labor Act with teeth in it, a revision such as will give the employer some rights, and which will make it criminal for any organizer to exploit labor for his own personal and selfish benefit, is needed urgently in order to give business a feeling of security, if we are going to thwart this new depression which is in the making.

Please bear in mind that the Wagner Labor Act and its administration has encouraged hundreds of so-called attorneys previously specializing in the profession of ambulance chasing, also anarchists and Socialists who don't believe in work, to take up this new and very profitable field of C. I. O. organizing, and I believe that if an unbiased committee of Congress were to study this perplexed labor question, take a little time to investigate the prosperous condition of some of these organizers, you will discover the root of the trouble. I happen to know one of these organizers, an attorney of little past reputation, who now lives in the swellest apartment of the city, drives the finest cars, and whose champagne bills run into hundreds of dollars. I happened to see some of the champagne being delivered, and let me tell you it did not make me feel any too good knowing the conditions prevailing here at our plant, whence the money came for the purchase of these luxuries.

If a clause was incorporated in a revised labor act making it criminal for any organizer to collect for his services any more than the average pay per week received by the trade he is organizing, you will find out how soon this organizing business by selfish people will "go to the dogs"—you will have honest organization by labor itself.

Labor unions under strict Government supervision, regulating compensation of organizers, and assurance that funds collected by the union be kept strictly for the benefit of the employees who pay their dues—a union whose officers are made up of employees, and not professional organizers, and a union whose finances will be audited under Government supervision—will soon eliminate all the troubles we have been through during the past few months, because, remember, practically the entire labor trouble today starts, not with labor itself but with those who take advantage of labor for their own selfish benefit.

I am writing this for I know you are deeply interested in the welfare of this country and its people; I am sure if you knew the condition from both manufacturers' and labor's point of view you will appreciate the necessity of some quick action. The problem in our own plant, which is small, comparatively, will make an interesting study for you who I know are looking for a solution to this labor trouble. An unbiased committee studying this problem can obtain very interesting information from our records, from us, and from independent talks to our employees, and, based on such information, you will be in position to put into effect changes to the present law which will eliminate future labor troubles. The problem is too large and important. Future relations between employer and labor can be established on an honest and safe basis by studies in such plants as ours.

Yours very truly,

ESKIMO KNITTING MILLS,
J. ROSENFELD, Vice President.

Mr. RICH. I do not know anything about the Eskimo Knitting Mills and I am not campaigning for them, but I am only trying to convey to the Members just what is happening in industry today. They present their complaints to Congress. If the Wagner Labor Relations Board is going to try to get industry and labor together, it should do everything it can to help both labor and industry, not to crush industry and do everything that radical labor would have you do, and break down all industry. What can you gain by such action? Such cooperation is vitally necessary to the welfare of our country today in order to give people employment. This controversy is not all one-sided. When we think that people who want to work are prohibited from working, as they have been in some plants in Pennsylvania during the last month, then we as Members of Congress are not looking after the welfare of the people who are interested in jobs when we make it possible for such things to happen. Crush industry by tyrannical laws

and you throw men out of jobs. Make proper changes in the Wagner Act at once before it is too late.

The right to work is as sacred to our tradition as the right to strike. I may say to the Members of Congress that people who operate industry have hearts just as big as have those who work in industry.

In almost every plant not more than 10 percent of the people who work are able or capable to operate or manage the plant. The 90 percent are dependent on the other 10 percent to give them employment. However, in the last year or two we have put such burdens and hardships on industry that many people in this country are willing to quit business. In fact, they are quitting; their opportunities are gone and there is no incentive to operate or expand business. They have come to the conclusion that the easiest thing to do is to give up and quit. That is fast becoming the situation. Is that what we in this Congress want to do, or do we want to help industry go along in order that it may give employment to the people of the country? Will we create jobs or will we destroy them by bad laws?

This is a serious question. This is no time to come in here and quibble and take one side of the situation against another. This is no time for us to be playing politics for our own personal advantage because we think more people will vote to reelect us to Congress if we side in with one side or the other. Now is the time we want to give to the problem the very best thought and consideration we possibly can for the sake of everybody in this country, in order that our country may be a better and a happier place in which to live. You must change the Wagner Act and get a competent Secretary of Labor at once, before it is too late.

I went up to the Boy Scout encampment last night and saw these young fellows, and thought what a fine thing it is for them to have the privilege of coming here to visit in Washington for the next week or 10 days. It is a trip and an experience they will never forget as long as they live. These are the boys who must carry on in the years to come. They are now being taught things that are manly, things that are upright, things that are going to make better citizens of them. If you Members of Congress have not already gone up to the encampment, go up some night during this coming week. It will be one of the finest experiences you have ever enjoyed, to have seen the beauty and the grandeur of the things they are trying to do to help these boys, and the boys to help themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a fine American organization.

Mr. RICH. One of the finest in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when we turn the Government over to these Boy Scouts in 20 years from now, will they find the freedom here in this country we have enjoyed during our lifetime? Will they find the Constitution governing our form of government? Will they find a House of Representatives, a Senate, composing the legislative branch of the Government? Will they find a President? Will they find a Supreme Court? My hope and prayer is that we can give to them a government such as our founders in 1776 intended that they should have. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had desired to submit a unanimous-consent request, but I understand a number of other gentlemen also have unanimous-consent requests to propound, and that objection will be made. I have a very brief statement I would like to put in the Record for the information of the House, but if there are going to be any other requests I cannot submit mine.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly

enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3259. An act for the relief of Laura E. Alexander;

H. R. 4795. An act to provide for a term of court at Livingston, Mont.;

H. R. 5394. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for and the addition thereof to the Yosemite National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended."

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2254. An act to amend section 460, chapter 44, title II, of the act entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the District of Alaska, and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said District", approved March 3, 1899, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3259. An act for the relief of Laura E. Alexander;

H. R. 4795. An act to provide for a term of court at Livingston, Mont.;

H. R. 5394. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain lands for, and the addition thereof to, the Yosemite National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6635. An act to dispense with the necessity for insurance by the Government against loss or damage to valuables in shipment, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 6, 1937, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Wednesday, July 7, 1937, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7158, to except yachts, tugs, towboats, and unrigged vessels from certain provisions of the act of June 25, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—POSTPONED

The meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, July 7, 1937, on H. R. 5182 and H. R. 6917—textile bills—is postponed until 10 a. m. Thursday, July 8, 1937.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

698. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill to grant to defendants in criminal cases the right to appeal against the sentence if it is deemed that the sentence imposed is excessive, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7667. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Ter-

ritories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; to raise revenue; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORD of California: A bill (H. R. 7756) to provide for the establishment of one Infantry battalion of Negro troops as a part of the National Guard of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEARIN: A bill (H. R. 7757) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 438) restoring the right of appeal to the Supreme Court in certain cases involving claims of the Sioux Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 7758) for the relief of May Elizabeth Cook; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7759) for the relief of Susan Lawrence Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 7760) for the relief of W. N. Penland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7761) for the relief of Sibbold Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7762) for the relief of Kenneth G. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 7763) for the relief of the Bruckmann Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2831. By Mr. CITRON: Petition of Labor's Non-Partisan League of Connecticut, endorsing the Black-Connery bill and another endorsing the President's Court proposals; to the Committee on Labor.

2832. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the New York County Lawyers' Association, recommending disapproval of House bill 11563, introduced by Congressman MURDOCK; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2833. Also, petition of the New York County Lawyers' Association committee on Federal legislation, disapproving House bill 11563, introduced by Mr. BUCK; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2834. Also, petition of the New York County Lawyers' Association, New York City, N. Y., recommending approval of Senate bill 1273, introduced by Senator COPELAND; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2835. Also, petition of the New York County Lawyers' Association, New York City, urging disapproval of House bill 5421, introduced by Congressman FERNANDEZ; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2836. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of T. Jones, Red Oak, Tex., favoring the so-called agricultural adjustment bill now being considered by the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2837. Also, petition of R. W. Siegert, president of the Smetana Agricultural Association, Bryan, Tex., and Bomar Tapp, Waxahachie, Tex., favoring the so-called agricultural adjustment bill now being considered by the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.